



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/847,667	05/01/2001	Subhash Gupta	54364	4777

7590 03/13/2002

The Law Offices of Calvin B. Ward  
Suite 305  
18 Crow Canyon Court  
San Ramon, CA 94583

EXAMINER

MITCHELL, JAMES M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2827

DATE MAILED: 03/13/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/847,667	Applicant(s) GUPTA ET AL.	
	Examiner James Mitchell	Art Unit 2827	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to the application filed May 1, 2001.

#### *Restrictions/ Election*

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-10, drawn to device, classified in class 257, subclass 777.
  - II. Claims 11-16, drawn to a method, classified in class 438, subclass 108.
2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:
3. Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product can be made by a different process, such as without the removing of material utilizing CMP.
4. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
5. During a telephone conversation with Calvin Ward on February 25, 2002 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-10. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 11-16 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

***Specification***

7. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract should be generally limited to single paragraph no more than 15 lines on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

8. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: the term "wafer comprising" is written twice. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

9. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

10. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. The depth by which the via extends into the substrate is critical or essential to the practice of the invention, but not included in the claim(s) is not enabled by the disclosure. See *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976). Applicant explicitly states that the depth is critical (Page 6, Paragraph 3).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

12. Claims 1-3, 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Clements (U.S 4,954,875).

13. Clements discloses a silicon wafer (10) comprising a substrate of wafer material having a first and second surface, the first surface having a circuit layer comprised of an integrated circuit formed thereon (Lines 26-27, Column 1; Lines 56-57, Column 8), a plurality of vias (Fig.1, Item 25) extending a first distance from said first surface (Shown more clearly in Fig. 12), said vias lined with an insulating silicon nitride (Fig. 9, Item 40) that inherently provides for an etch stop that is more resistant to chemical/ mechanical polishing than said wafer material, the via filled with an electrically conductive material (Lines 1-2, Column 10).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

16. Claims 6 -10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clements as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Hsuan et al. (U.S 6,268,642).

17. Clements further discloses the vias terminating in an electrically conducting pad (33) with the wafer, the integrated circuit inherently being formed beneath the pad (Lines 49-50, Column 6), and an electrical conductor (the conductive material in the via) connected electrically to said via (Fig. 9).

18. Although Clements does not explicitly show a dielectric layer covering the integrated circuit, Hsuan utilizes a dielectric layer covering an integrated circuit (Fig. 2C).

19. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to form a dielectric layer over the integrated circuit of Clements, such that the buried electrical conductor (conductive material in via) extends through the dielectric, in order to protect the integrated circuit devices as taught by Hsuan (Lines 42-44, Column 4).

20. With respect to claim 6, the examiner takes official notice that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to fill the via with tungsten, since the use of

tungsten at the time the invention was made, was well known in the art for electrical contact.

### ***Conclusion***

21. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Linder (WO 96/13062A), Gnadinger (U.S. 5,229,647), Zavracky et al. (U.S. 5,793,115), Hsai et al. (U.S. 6,147,409), and Chkravorty (U.S. 5,098,860).

The prior art discloses in Linder and Gnadinger the use of stacked wafers electrically attached at respective pads, in Zavracky an integrated circuit formed on a first surface of a wafer, in Hsia the use of TiN as an etch stop, and in Chakravorty the use of a via lined with tantalum etch stop and an insulating layer.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Mitchell whose telephone number is (703) 305-0244. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10:30-8:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dave Talbott can be reached on (703) 305-9883. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-3432 for regular communications and (703) 305-3230 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Application/Control Number: 09/847,667

Page 7

Art Unit: 2827

*jmm*

jmm

March 7, 2002

*David E. Graybill*

DAVID E. GRAYBILL  
PRIMARY EXAMINER